

ruling under review. We are anxiously awaiting the outcome of this review.

In the meantime, I am pleased to join my colleagues in stating my strong support for stem cell research. There is broad agreement, across party lines, that this research is important, it could save lives, and it should not be halted.

In its report, "Ethical Issues in Human Stem Cell Research," the National Bioethics Advisory Commission (NBAC) concludes that stem cell research should be allowed to go forward with federal support, as long as researchers were limited to only two sources of stem cells: fetal tissue and embryos resulting from infertility treatments. And they recommend that federal support to be contingent on an open system of oversight and review.

NBAC also arrived at the important conclusion that it is ethically acceptable for the federal government to finance research that both derives cell lines from embryos and that uses those cell lines. Their report states, "Relying on cell lines that might be derived exclusively by a subset of privately funded researchers who are interested in this area could severely limit scientific and clinical progress."

The Commission goes on to say that "scientists who conduct basic research and are interested in fundamental cellular processes are likely to make elemental discoveries about the nature of ES [embryonic stem] cells as they derive them in the laboratory."

NBAC's report presents reasonable guidelines for federal policy. Our bill bans human embryo research, but allows federally-funded scientists to derive human pluripotent stem cells from human embryos if those embryos are obtained from IVF clinics, if the donor has provided informed consent and the embryo was no longer needed for fertility treatments. The American Society of Cell Biology estimates that 100,000 human embryos are currently frozen in IVF clinics, in excess of their clinical need.

In addition, our language requires HHS and NIH to develop procedural guidelines to make sure that stem cell research is conducted in an ethical, sound manner. As it stands today, stem cell research in the private sector is not subject to federal monitoring or ethical requirements.

Mr. President, stem cell research holds such hope, such potential for millions of Americans who are sick and in pain, it is morally wrong for us to prevent or delay our world-class scientists from building on the progress that has been made.

As long as this research is conducted in an ethically validated manner, it should be allowed to go forward, and it should receive federal support. That is why Senator SPECTER and I have joined together on legislation that will allow our nation's top scientists to pursue

critical cures and therapies for the diseases and chronic conditions which strike too many Americans. I urge my Senate colleagues to join us in supporting this bill.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 66—EX-PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE RELEASE OF TWENTY-FOUR UNITED STATES MILITARY PERSONNEL CURRENTLY BEING DETAINED BY THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. THOMAS (for himself, Mr. KERRY, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DODD, Mr. TORRIGELLI, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mrs. CARNAHAN, Mr. CONRAD, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. BAYH, Mr. CAMPBELL, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. KOHL, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. INOUE, Mr. JOHNSON, and Ms. SNOWE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 66

Whereas, at 9:15 a.m. local time on April 1, 2001, a collision occurred between a United States military EP-3E Aries II reconnaissance aircraft and one of two F-8 jet fighters from the People's Liberation Army-Air Force of the People's Republic of China sent to intercept it;

Whereas both countries agree that the collision occurred in international airspace over the South China Sea near the Chinese island province of Hainan;

Whereas due to the damage incurred in the unfortunate accidental collision, the F-8 and its pilot were lost at sea and the EP-3E was required to make a "Mayday" distress call on the internationally recognized emergency radio frequency;

Whereas because of the resultant structural damage to the EP-3E aircraft it effectuated an emergency landing at a military airbase at Lingshui, Hainan;

Whereas upon landing the twenty-four United States military personnel aboard the EP-3E were removed from the aircraft by Chinese military personnel and detained in an undisclosed location, notwithstanding the fact that the crew of an aircraft forced to land on foreign soil in an emergency is considered under international norms to have sovereign immunity;

Whereas Chinese authorities unnecessarily prevented United States military and consular officials from meeting with the crew members until April 3, 2001, then permitting only a short, supervised visit, and has, to date, denied further visits;

Whereas in contravention of international norms Chinese officials have boarded the aircraft and may have removed portions of the equipment therefrom;

Whereas international law recognizes both the right of the crew of an aircraft in dis-

tress to land safely on foreign soil and the inviolable sovereignty of an aircraft in distress that has landed on foreign soil;

Whereas international law recognizes the right of a nation which has had an aircraft land in distress on foreign soil to have its citizens and aircraft returned safely and without undue delay; and

Whereas President Bush has requested that the People's Republic of China arrange the "prompt and safe return of the crew and the return of the aircraft without further damage[] or tampering," and has noted that a failure by Chinese authorities to do so would be "inconsistent with standard diplomatic practice;"

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, that:

(1) the Senate expresses its regret at the damage and loss of life occasioned by the accidental collision of the two aircraft;

(2) it is the sense of the Senate that the government of the People's Republic of China should:

(a) immediately release the crew members of the EP-3E into the custody of United States military or consular officials, and allow them to leave the country; and

(b) return the EP-3E aircraft and all its equipment to the possession of the United States, without any further boarding or inspection, or removal of equipment; and

(3) the Senate fully supports the continuing efforts of the President to ensure the safe return of the crew and the aircraft.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise today as the Chairman of the Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to speak to S. Res. 66.

As we are all now aware, at 9:15 a.m. local time on April 1, 2001, a collision occurred between a United States military EP-3E Aries II reconnaissance aircraft flying off the coast of the People's Republic of China, PRC and one of two F-8 jet fighters from the People's Liberation Army-Air Force sent to intercept it. Both countries agree that the collision occurred in international airspace over the South China Sea near the Chinese island province of Hainan. Due to the damage incurred in the accidental collision, the F-8 and its pilot were lost at sea and the EP-3E was required to make a "Mayday" distress call on the internationally recognized emergency radio frequency.

In fact, the damage to our plane was so bad that it effectuated an emergency landing at a military airbase at Lingshui, Hainan. Upon landing, the twenty-four United States military personnel aboard the EP-3E were removed from the aircraft by Chinese military personnel and detained in an undisclosed location, notwithstanding the fact that the crew of an aircraft forced to land on foreign soil in an emergency is considered under international norms to have sovereign immunity.

Chinese authorities then unnecessarily prevented United States military and consular officials from meeting with the crew members until April 3, 2001, and even then permitted only a

short, supervised visit. There is absolutely *no* reason why we should not have been allowed at the very least telephone access to our military people. China is not a technologically backward country without phone service; our people are not being held in some isolated mountain village in the middle of a jungle. China's behavior in this case in purposefully keeping us from contacting the aircrew is, to me, disturbing.

In addition, I am also concerned that in contravention of international norms, Chinese officials have boarded the aircraft and have apparently removed portions of the equipment from it. International law recognizes both the right of the crew of an aircraft in distress to land safely on foreign soil and the inviolable sovereignty of an aircraft in distress that has landed on foreign soil; it also recognizes the right of a nation which has had an aircraft land in distress on foreign soil to have its citizens and aircraft returned safely and without undue delay.

China's flaunting of these conventions disturbs me not just because of the ramifications in this particular case, but also because it has the capability of wrecking greater havoc on the overall bilateral US-PRC relationship, a relationship I believe to be our most important in Asia along with Japan and South Korea. The Chinese government needs to realize that this issue is bigger than just this crew and this plane. This is about trust, about whether the PRC can be trusted to live up to its word, to live up to international agreements which it has signed, and to be a part of the world community of nations. So far, they have turned their backs on those agreements, and on their obligations. They have shown me, and other Members of Congress, that whether they can be trusted is presently open to question.

If this matter is not resolved immediately and satisfactorily, then the Congress needs to rethink whether Beijing can be trusted to fulfill its obligations as a member of the WTO. And while I have previously stated that I believe it would be a mistake to include such materiel as Aegis-equipped destroyers in this year's weapons sales to Taiwan, if Beijing remains intransigent and continues to violate norms of decent international behavior in this case, then I—for one—will begin to reassess whether Taiwan is not justified in its mistrust of the PRC and whether such sales might not now be justified. It would truly be a shame if, at the beginning of a new Administration, an Administration that has not even had a chance yet to formulate or articulate its China policy, this situation poisoned the well.

The resolution is simple. It expresses our regret over the damage to the aircraft and the loss of life resulting from the collision. It calls on the Chinese

government to release the crew, who are, of course, utmost in our thoughts and concern; the aircraft, and the equipment from the aircraft. Finally, it supports President Bush in his efforts. I am pleased that the resolution has a bipartisan list of seventy-five co-sponsors, including the ranking member of the East Asia Subcommittee [Mr. KERRY]; the very distinguished President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND]; the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. WARNER]; the Chairman of the Energy Committee [Mr. MURKOWSKI]; three members and the ranking minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR], Mr. SMITH of Oregon and Mr. BROWNBACK, and Senator BIDEN; two Senators who I consider among the most knowledgeable on China in the Senate, Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator BAUCUS; and one of our newest members, Senator CLINTON.

I hope that we will act to put the Senate on record on this issue.

SENATE RESOLUTION 67—COM- MENDING THE BLUE DEVILS OF DUKE UNIVERSITY FOR WINNING THE 2001 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION MEN'S BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. HELMS (for himself and Mr. EDWARDS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 67

Whereas the 2000-2001 Duke University Blue Devils' men's basketball team (referred to in this resolution as the "Duke Blue Devils") had a spectacular season;

Whereas the Duke Blue Devils finished the regular season with a 26-4 record, claiming a record 5 straight finishes in first place during the Atlantic Coast Conference regular season;

Whereas the Duke Blue Devils won the 2001 Atlantic Coast Conference Tournament Championship, winning the championship of that tournament for the third year in a row;

Whereas the Duke Blue Devils are the first men's basketball team to be a number 1 seed in the National Collegiate Athletic Association's Men's Basketball Tournament during 4 consecutive seasons since that association began seeding teams in 1979;

Whereas the Duke Blue Devils amassed the most wins, 133, in a 4-year period of any National Collegiate Athletic Association men's basketball team in history;

Whereas Shane Battier received the 2001 Naismith Award as men's college basketball Player of the Year;

Whereas Coach Mike Krzyzewski has taken the Duke Blue Devils to 7 national championship games in 16 years;

Whereas Coach Krzyzewski led the Duke Blue Devils to the team's third national championship;

Whereas the Duke Blue Devils are a fine example of academic and athletic dedication and success;

Whereas the team's success during the 2000-2001 season was truly a team accomplishment; and

Whereas the Duke Blue Devils won the 2001 National Collegiate Athletic Association Men's Basketball Championship: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate commends the Blue Devils of Duke University for winning the 2001 National Collegiate Athletic Association Men's Basketball Championship.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 192. Mr. DOMENICI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 170 proposed by Mr. DOMENICI to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 193. Mr. DOMENICI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 83, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 194. Mr. DOMENICI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 83, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 195. Mr. DOMENICI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 83, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 196. Mr. DORGAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 83, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 197. Mr. DORGAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 83, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 198. Mr. DORGAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 83, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 199. Mr. CLELAND (for himself, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. TORRICELLI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 83, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 200. Mr. BREAUX (for himself, Mr. NELSON, of Nebraska, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mrs. CARNAHAN, Mr. CHAFEE, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. BAYH, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. JEFFORDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 83, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 201. Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. SMITH, of New Hampshire) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 170 proposed by Mr. DOMENICI to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) supra.

SA 202. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. DASCHLE) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 170 proposed by Mr. DOMENICI to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) supra.

SA 203. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 170 proposed by Mr. DOMENICI to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 204. Mr. BYRD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 83, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 205. Mr. BYRD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the